



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOARD OF EDITORS OF THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

CHANDLER P. ANDERSON, Washington, D. C.
CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY, State University of Iowa.
AMOS S. HERSHEY, Indiana University.
CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, Chicago, Ill.
GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY, Columbia University.
ROBERT LANSING, Watertown, N. Y.
JOHN BASSETT MOORE, Columbia University.
GEORGE G. WILSON, Harvard University.
THEODORE S. WOOLSEY, Yale University.

Editor in Chief

JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,
Washington, D. C.

Business Manager

GEORGE A. FINCH, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,
Washington, D. C.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSION IN RELATION TO UNIVERSAL PEACE

On June 25, 1910, the Congress of the United States passed unanimously the following joint resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

In his annual message to Congress, dated December 6, 1910, President Taft stated:

I have not as yet made appointments to this commission because I have invited and am awaiting the expressions of foreign governments as to their willingness to cooperate with us in the appointment of similar commissions or representatives who would meet with our commissioners and by joint action seek to make their work effective.

It is impossible to overstate the importance of the joint resolution and the action of the President taken upon it. The mere statement of the resolution and the President's action shows that international peace is no longer to be the concern of unofficial and irresponsible peace enthusiasts, but that responsible statesmen in office, under the pressure of enlightened and persistent public opinion, are henceforth to devote their time and energy to the advancement of international peace. The cause has not merely become respectable; it has become official, and measures for its realization are to figure in governmental programmes of the future.

The Ladds and the Burritts, the Channings and the Sumners, and the devoted band of pacifists have not lived in vain, although, as always happens, they are not permitted to see the realization of the plans which they outlined and for which they suffered endless ridicule and unsparing scorn at the hands of the so-called practical people who revel in the past and whose eyes are blinded to the future and its measureless promise.

An analysis of this epoch-making document shows that its fundamental purpose is universal peace, which is evidently considered by Congress as possible; for, if it is not possible, how is it to be preserved? War is to be prevented, for war is inconsistent with peace and its preservation. Hence a state of things in which war may not exist is contemplated as possible by Congress. This, likewise, is a great advance, because practical people too often consider war as inevitable, as something inherent in the human race and without which mankind could not live or civilization endure. "A perpetual peace," said Von Moltke, "is a dream and not even a beautiful dream. War is one of the elements of order in the world established by God. The noblest virtues of man are developed therein. Without war the world would degenerate and disappear in the morass of materialism." Yet, the Congress, composed of eminently practical people, gives the professional soldier the lie.

In the next place, Congress evidently considers armaments as a menace to universal peace, because the purpose of the resolution is to

preserve peace, which is regarded as already existing. If Congress considered armament as peace-preserving, it would not have proposed its limitation. On the contrary, Congress would have suggested its increase, on the theory that the greater the armament the greater is the guarantee of peace which it is the purpose of the resolution to preserve. This is an important declaration, for it recognizes the fact, patent to the man in the street, that armament is for use, not for ornament. The decrease of armament, not its increase, is peace-preserving; and, therefore, armament must be limited. But reduction by any one nation, or by any group of nations, is not sufficient. All nations should reduce their armament, not by separate, but by international, agreement.

The United States knows by experience that the limitation of armament is an unmixed good, and that an undefended boundary line is not an incitement to invasion. The Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817, limited the naval force to be maintained upon the Great Lakes by Great Britain and the United States to the following vessels on each side:

On Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding one hundred tons burden, and armed with one eighteen pound cannon.

On the Upper Lakes, to two vessels not exceeding like burden each, and armed with like force.

On the waters of Lake Champlain, to one vessel not exceeding like burden, and armed with like force.

All other armed vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.

Argentine and Chile did not fly at one another's throats because they agreed to limit, and actually did limit, their armaments for a period of years.¹ What two have done, others may do. An arbitration treaty between two, and by the nations as a whole in groups of two, may be merged into a general agreement between all nations to arbitrate their differences. The French maxim *ce n'est que le premier pas qui coute* is applicable with this difference: the first step does not cost but saves. It is the glory of Great Britain and the United States that they agreed upon a limitation of armaments upon boundary waters at the close of a war, and that the agreement stands to-day as it did almost a century ago,

¹ Treaty of May 28, 1902, and special protocol of January 9, 1903, by virtue of which a part of the fleets of the two countries was dismantled, the armed cruisers in course of construction on account of the respective governments were sold upon the docks, and the countries agreed for a period of five years to abstain from the acquisition of vessels of war. See SUPPLEMENT to this JOURNAL, Vol. 1, pp. 294 and 297 (July, 1907).

secure in the affections and the enlightened judgment of the two nations. War has not resulted from his concession to reason, and we shall never know how much the absence of aggressive armaments has contributed to the hundred years of peace between the two countries which it is proposed to celebrate in an appropriate manner. Guns are made to shoot just as the knife is made to cut, and we know that the knife in careless hands does cut. A boy will whittle if he has a knife, and if the stick is not forthcoming it is provided; and nations in their foreign relations are little better than children.

But to revert to the resolution. The limitation of armament is not only a means to universal peace and its preservation, but it lessens military expenditures. The Congress evidently regards military expenditures as an evil, because they are to be diminished. Such expenditures can not be considered by the Congress as conducive to peace, otherwise they should not be diminished. If increased military expenditures would usher in universal peace and preserve it when existing, then the Congress should not advise that military expenditures be diminished.

In the same way, if war really brings about peace, that is to say, if war is in the interest of peace, it would seem unwise to lessen the probabilities of war, for by so doing a guarantee for peace is ruthlessly brushed aside. Evidently the Congress is not impressed by war as an agency of peace, and in rejecting the maxim "If you want peace prepare for war" it seems to prefer another doctrine "If you want peace prepare for peace."

The Congress looks to existing agencies for the accomplishment of its purpose, but it goes on to consider the advisability of forming an international force by combining the navies of the world. Armaments are to be limited by international agreement, military expenditures are to be diminished, the probabilities of war are to be lessened, and, most astounding of all, an international force is contemplated "for the preservation of universal peace" based apparently upon the principles of international justice and in pursuance of international agreement.

For the hip-pocket method of the mining camp and the groups of battleships that prowl about and infest the seas, a supreme international force is to be created which, under central direction, will repress lawlessness and disorder and make the practice of nations conform to their peaceful professions. Independence slips into interdependence, and disorganization assumes the stately form of international organization. It matters not that the day of realization be far distant; the Congress

contemplates seriously such a transformation and directs its commission to consider it, and the President of the United States has already sounded the nations of the world upon the proposition. In a word, one government, not the least respected or the least influential in the family of nations, and which can not be accused of acting under a sense of fear for it has a vast ocean to the east and west and pacific neighbors to the north and south, has risen to the opportunity of leadership.

The first peace society was founded in New York while our country was unfortunately at war with Great Britain and while the echoes of Waterloo were in the air. The movement towards peace has grown from modest beginnings and its gospel has been preached in all quarters of the globe. War is on the defensive. Its partisans are alarmed. The vast armaments and the well-nigh incalculable expenditure for its maintenance are solemnly declared by its partisans to be solely in the interest of peace. "O, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" But, notwithstanding increased armies and navies, the military spirit as such is decreasing. This fact, for fact it is, does not rest upon the assertions of the pacifists. It is the confession of the partisans of

The simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

Thus, an American militiaman recently stated that the military spirit in America is at a low ebb and gave as his reasons:

The influence of Andrew Carnegie and his peace fund of \$10,000,000.

The Lake Mohonk Peace Conference and similar movements.

The hostile attitude of women public school teachers for military drill and military spirit in schools.

The hostility to things military by the Boy Scouts of America.

The great tendency to commercialism, and worship of the dollar.

The large amount of time consumed by social obligations.

The jealous hostility of the average wives to the amount of time that their husbands must give to military interests and affairs.

The large amount of ridicule to which military officers are subjected.

The large number of fraternal organizations that are permitted to wear gorgeous military uniforms to the disadvantage of the plainer uniforms now used by soldiers.

The lack of education in part of the general public in regard to military affairs.

It is not known what replies the Powers are making to President Taft's circular informing them of the joint resolution. Whether they are sympathetic or unsympathetic matters little. The war system is at

bay, and the sharp tooth of time will reach a vital spot. Our peace-loving President is backed by a peace-loving people, and it is a source of comfort and consolation that the Mother Country has not turned a deaf ear to the entreaty of the First Born, for Sir Edward Grey has solemnly stated from his place in the House of Commons, as the mouthpiece of the British Government and as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs:

Unless the incongruity and mischief [of mounting military costs] be brought home not only to the heads of men generally but to their feelings as well, * * * the rivalry will continue and it must in the long run break down civilization. You are having this great burden piled up in times of peace, and if it goes on increasing by leaps and bounds as it has done in the last generation it will become intolerable. There are those who think that it will lead to war precisely because it is already becoming intolerable. I think it much more likely that the burden will be dissipated by an internal revolution, by a revolt of the masses of men against taxation.

At the close of the debate a motion welcoming the establishment of international armaments, that is, the creation of an international police for the maintenance of general peace, was carried by a vote of 276 to 56.

THE RED CROSS IN CIVIL WARS.

Article 24 of the Geneva Convention of 1906 declares that the provisions of the said convention are obligatory only upon the contracting Powers in case of war between two or more of them, and are not binding if only one of the Powers is a party to the treaty; in other words, the convention can not become operative as respects the sick and wounded in war unless two or more signatory Powers are parties to the conflict.

But what as to the application of the principles that must govern Red Cross activities in a case of civil disturbance within a State or its dependencies? Supposing on the one hand that the State where some are in revolt is not a party to the treaty?

The precedents for the intervention of the Red Cross of neutral States in civil wars are several, notably the activity of the Dutch Red Cross with the Boer forces in South Africa, the American Red Cross with the Cubans in their last revolt against Spain, the recent instance of aid given to Nicaraguan wounded prisoners, and to the families of the victims of Turkish atrocities in Armenia.

The existence at this moment of an attempt to overthrow the Government of Mexico and the apparent existence of much suffering by the sick and wounded emphasizes the pertinency of the question stated.